



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,473	10/07/2003	Nobuchika Kobayashi	116910	6664
25944	7590	10/21/2004		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				
			EXAMINER PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/679,473

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI, NOBUCHIKA

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/7/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. Figures 7-8 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated (see Paragraph 4 of the instant invention and Sumida et al. (6506060). See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 2, paragraph 9, "bow" should be changed to -- box --. On Page 1: "Description of Related Art" should be changed to -- Description of Prior Art --.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 3: "into" should be changed to -- from --. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites the connector connection circuit and the fuse connection circuit divided into each other as well as connected to each other, which makes it not enabled.

Note: It has been assumed to be connected for this analysis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) or [Sumida et al. (6506060)].

AAPA [Figures 7-8 and Description of related (actually prior) art of the instant invention] or Sumida shows a junction box 1 with a connector connection circuit and a fuse connection circuit to form a connector module 2 and a fuse module 3 connected to

Art Unit: 2839

each other, the connector module having stacked circuit boards, each with an insulating board 8 and bus bars 7, the fuse module having an insulating board 3a and bus bars 3b connectable to fuse terminals wherein the fuse bus bars are made from a sheet of conductive metal and the bus bars 7a-1 and 7a-2 connected by a tab 7a-3 which can be cut off.

But AAPA or Sumida does not show connectable circuits and separable circuits separable to produce any specified circuit. Such a feature is well known in the art of electrical connectors. Saka (Figures 1-9) shows several embodiments of an electrical connection box for doing so. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature to AAPA's or Sumida's junction box because this would provide an electrical connection box which can easily respond to a change in the circuit construction among different types of vehicles or different grades of the same type of vehicle as taught by Saka (see the abstract).

As to claim 3, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide a removable (sacrificial) tab in the fuse bus bars similar to those shown for the connector bus bars because this would provide a bridge between fuse bus bars as shown by AAPA for the connector bus bars.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jones et al. (6700795), Maue et al. (4689718), Burdick (2003/0082937) and Chiriku et al. (2002/0157852).

***Contact Information***

10. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (571) 272-2099.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is (703) 872-9306.



Chandrika Prasad  
Primary examiner  
October 13, 2004